



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.								
10/786,429	02/25/2004	Jay C. Buckey	DC-0257	1958								
7590 Jane Massey Licata Licata & Tyrrell P.C. 66 E. Main Street Marlton, NJ 08053		10/18/2007	<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">HUI, SAN MING R</td></tr><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>1617</td><td></td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		HUI, SAN MING R		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1617	
EXAMINER												
HUI, SAN MING R												
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER											
1617												
			<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>10/18/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	10/18/2007	PAPER					
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE											
10/18/2007	PAPER											

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/786,429

Applicant(s)

BUCKEY ET AL.

Examiner

San-ming Hui

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2007.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 8, 2007 has been entered.

Claim 1 is pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueno in view of Drug Information Handbook, BMJ (British Medical Journal, Feb 1970, pages 481-483), Weinstein et al., Abstract of Aviat Space Environ Med, 1997;68(10):890-894, and Kohl et al., abstract of Aviat Space Environ Med, 1991;62(5):392-396, Ueno and Drug Information Handbook are references of record.

Ueno et al. teaches treatment of S. murinus by administering 20mg/kg of chlorpheniramine in treating motion sickness (see the abstract).

Ueno et al. does not expressly teach the dosage of chlorpheniramine as 12mg. Ueno et al. does not expressly teach chlorpheniramine as administered orally.

Drug Informaiton Handbook teaches the human dosage of chlorpheniramine as 8-12mg every 8-12 hours (See the usual dosage section).

BMJ teaches various antihistamine are useful orally to treat vomiting, which is a symptoms of motion sickness (See Table 1, page 483).

Weinstein et al. teaches common pharmacological agents for treating symptoms of motion sickness in the U.S. are over-the-counter antihistamines and they are orally administered.

Kohl et al. teaches oral terfenadine as effective in treating motion sickness.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to employ chlorpheniramine orally in a dosage of 12 mg in a method of treating motion sickness.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ chlorpheniramine orally in a dosage of 12 mg in a method of treating motion sickness.

Art Unit: 1617

The human dose of chlorpheniramine encompasses the dosage herein claimed. Furthermore, other various known anti-histamines are often administered orally when treating motion sickness as evidenced by BMJ, Weinstein et al. and Kohl et al. Thus, administering chlorpheniramine, also an anti-histamine, orally to treat motion sickness would be obvious. Therefore, possessing the teachings of the cited prior art, one of ordinary skill in the art would employ the old and well known compound, chlorpheniramine, in a dosage of 12 mg, orally in the method of treating symptoms of motion sickness.

Response to Arguments


Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to San-ming Hui whose telephone number is (571) 272-0626. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 9:00 to 1:00, Tu - Fri from 9:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, PhD., can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


San-ming Hui
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617